

*The following is a summary of the comments and questions asked, along with the answers given at the Stockton meeting hosted by the Department of Water Resources on August 21, 2008*

**Q: (comment made by Dante Nomellini, not a question to the panel.)**

**I wanted to make a comment. Our view is that this is just an attempt to build an isolated facility, which we view as unauthorized and a breach to the promises that are imbedded in the Delta Protection Act. The common pool that was to be provided in the Delta would be violated by any isolated facility. We view this as an illegal process that is corrupted and we don't think that this is an independent process. Our information indicates that a decision was made before this process was even started. The administration is going to move for an isolated canal called the Peripheral Canal.**

**We will provide defense to any landowner who resists the access that you seek. As to the purpose of the project, it's been well known for years that the project operations have been killing fish. Back in 1978, the State Water Resources Control Board found that in order to mitigate the fish you would reduce the exports to zero. The projects didn't do that and in recent years Jerry Brown was involved in the operation.**

**You knew you were taking fish. You knew that you were killing the fish yet you continued the high levels of exports.**

**The State Water Project was supposed to bring 5 million acre feet of North Coast water to supplement water into the Delta by the year 2000. They haven't done that. Basically you have no water available for export by the State Water Project. The State Water Project needs to curtail its diversions from the Delta, not only the intake from the Sacramento River. We believe that the intake from the Sacramento River in the PPIC report clearly displays the sacrifice of the Delta. We think this clearly violates the Delta Protection Act. It was suppose to provide salinity control for the Delta and adequate water supply. This project will not do it.**

**We are here. We are going to resist the early activity and leave it up to the landowners to make their decision on whether they want to cooperate or not. If they don't want to corporate we are going to help them. Thank you.**

**Q: A lot of people live in and around the Delta. My family has been in the Delta since the turn of the last century. You want to build the Peripheral Canal. You're doing a CEQA document that substantiates it and you are spending tax payer money. Aren't you?**

**A: The funding comes from water users who get water supplies from the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project.**

**Q: You stated earlier that the State Water Project is paying for this. That the water projects are paying for this.**

**A: Specifically for this. The contractors are paying for this outside the normal billing processes.**

**Q: So they are paying for every staff person at DWR?**

**A:** Two things here. The normal bills we send out to operate the State Water Project, about a billion dollar utility, pays for staff that run the program and pays for the overhead. This specific activity, this big conservation planning effort is being paid for by separate funding sources.

**Q: If you divert water around the Delta could there be an environmental effect and increase salinity in the Delta?**

**A:** It could, yes. The Environmental Impact Report will be addressing all of these impacts. We have not analyzed that at this time.

**Q: Does salinity hurt or help the fish?**

**A:** Most of the fish in the estuary are estuary fish. They are estuary fish and live in fresh and salt water during different times of their life. So some of them do not care what the salinity is. The Delta smelt are sometimes out in Suisun Bay where it is very salty. They move in and out of the estuary where the water is fresher. They spawn and then they go back to salt water again.

**Q: You will need to look at the effect of the lack of dilution. Otherwise the water will be transported through the Delta directly.**

**A:** Sure.

**Q: I find the emphasis on fish rather than the residents and activities going on in the Delta to be rather disconcerting this evening. The comment that was made that the water is coming through the Delta from the San Joaquin River, I took it to mean that you hoped that there is fresh water coming from the San Joaquin River.**

I also find the timing with the PPIC Report to be consequential with the meeting we are having tonight. They don't seem to have considered any Delta points of view in their report. It is almost like we are looking at the group from 25,000 feet and dropping.

I find that the comments that were made only briefly regarding seismic or earthquake issues to be interesting. I think there is greater risk along the existing water project south of the Delta. I also need to point out that any Peripheral Canal that is built will have the same seismic risk as the existing one. Delta water quality is an issue for both fish and for the people in the South Valley. Our water quality is considerably better than what the Southern California is getting from the Southern Colorado River. I have difficulty understanding why they are complaining about our water. We don't mind sharing the water that is surplus, but we don't want a bully line at the drinking fountain at the school.

**What would happen if we start diverting water to Sacramento and north of the Delta? The State of California has broken a lot of promises over the years. It's hard to trust them. The existing State Water Project has never been completed.**

**As to storage or south valley drain, folks south of the Delta have relied on promised water that the State cannot deliver. Now they are mad because they relied on things that never really happened. It appears that the South Delta Improvement Plan is dead in the water.**

**Q: I live in the Delta. My extended family has lived in the Delta since 1839. I heard the word "share" several times tonight, but this is not a sharing project. The only way the Delta will survive is if the rest of the State shares in drought and in surplus. That will not happen with an isolated facility.**

**By sending out these letters to landowners you have created a disclosure situation. I wonder if you know that. They now need to be telling any prospective buyer that they are on the map. It does not create any confidence in this process to understand that water contractors are paying for it.**

**Q: In LA awhile ago we were rationed where we couldn't water our lawn. Has it changed at all? I think it has. Also, you said that there was something that could have been done years ago and should have been done. What was that and why was that not done?**

**A: I was referring to a comprehensive Delta plan for the Central Valley. Flood control has been historically under-funded in California. Those of you who are part of the flood control within the Delta know that the program was severely under-funded because it relied on the General Fund. The passing of these two bond issues were near the amount of money that this needs. The Delta Protection Program was started in 1974.**

**Q: "We haven't made up our mind." I would like to know who in particular has not made up their mind. Have you made up your mind that some type of isolated facility needs to be part of this BDCP?**

**A: Good question. From my stand point, I think there can be some improvements made concerning how we convey water across the Delta. From a decision making process, the public agencies that I work for can't make a decision on this until we go through all of the environmental impact analyses. A lot of things have changed, but the way they are conveying water through the Delta now is not efficient for fish and can be improved. I think that we may evaluate this and come up with another way if we can.**

**Q: What would it take for you to recommend something to your boss other than an isolated facility?**

**A:** The environmental process that we are going through now is exactly the type of deal we would need to make that kind of decision. We want to collect the data so we know what the decision should be. It should be evaluated.

**Q:** You showed us on the map how moving intakes up north would be good for fish. I would like to see that evidence, but assuming that it is looking out for what is best for fish and exporters. I'm wondering who is looking out for the Delta folks, in Delta water quality. This common pool is a good design that can help meet a lot of needs at the same time. I see the needs of the Delta being thrown aside if it is based just on fish and just on exporters. Who is looking out for what is best for the in Delta folks as part of this process?

**A:** That's a good point. Up until now it has been principally focused on the aquatic ecosystem. We have been looking at the fish and staying in the water. So far we have been looking at the people who will fund the plan or own the plan in terms of permitting the plan. We need to get better information on who might be affected by the plan and that is part of the reason we are talking to you tonight. These studies will help us understand the environmental effects.

There are issues. If we were to build one of these systems there will be all kinds of issues that we will have to work through. We have to figure out a better way to get your input into that process.

**Q:** Is it safe to say that one of the goals of this plan is to do what is best for the Delta folks and for the Delta water quality?

**A:** The principal goal of this plan is to resolve the conflict between fish and water supply issues. You have to get a Federal Endangered Species Act permit. In that process we have to evaluate what the water quality issues are for everyone in the Delta. All of that has to be disclosed and evaluated in the environmental process.

Our goal is not to provide water for farmers in the Central Valley, but that will need to be evaluated. There will be opportunities for other people to benefit. When you talk about moving water around in the Delta by the City of Stockton there may be other benefits. Another possibility is to cut across the County. Moving their intake closer to our intake may provide them some benefits. We want to explore how others can benefit from this project besides just the projects and the fish. That requires discussions with folks and we are trying to initiate that now.

The Environmental Impact Report will address other issues besides fish. It will address the impacts to agriculture, cultural resources, economics, land use, air quality, noise and verity of issues that are community related. These will be evaluated against the project alternatives and the no project action. It will allow the public to have the information of disclosure. Being able to compare and contrast those decisions as well as the decision makers.

**Q:** You are looking at the impacts of building a canal. It is glaringly apparent to me that the goal of the process is not what is best for the in Delta folks. It is better for fish if

**we do this. Who is going to be sacrificed in the process? Are you going to abandon the water quality in the Delta? Not care about levees anymore? It is not a priority. You're not looking for a true fix.**

**Q: You stated that we lost 750,000 acre feet of water. What happened to it? Did it go south? What does that mean that it was lost?**

**A:** Most of the impact that we suffered was before March 13. Most of that water went out of the Delta that we could not capture. What we normally operated to was not what we did and the water went out the Delta. It was not exported.

**Q: The EIR will be working with fish species, but what about the terrestrial species? I understand why fish species need to be looked at, but I do not understand why new construction projects should be included in the BDCP. New construction means that you are going to get further away from the Peripheral Canal or something like it. terrestrial species that are not covered in BDCP are finished. How are terrestrial species going to be covered for new construction? How are you going to look at terrestrial species that rely on agricultural land? How are you going to look at agricultural land being flooded [due to] ignored levees etc.? You need to look at the hawk. You need to look at the giant garter snake. This is going right through the only part of the county that has giant garter snake left. Is the EIR going to address that? How is this plan going to cover these species since it is not covered in any of the programs?**

**A:** The Environmental Impact Report will be focusing on the endangered and threatened fish species. But the direct and indirect impacts to all of the vegetation communities and other biological resources including terrestrial resources will be assessed in their potential impacts to wetlands. Any grading or disturbance associated with that will be evaluated as well as any impact of inundation.

**Q: The authorities only have take permits for aquatic species. They don't have take authority for terrestrial species?**

**A:** Yes, the Habitat Conservation Plan will be focusing on those species. However, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, requirements for mitigation are that any significant impact for biological resources will have mitigation associated with it regardless of the Habitat Conservation Plan.

**Q: So they are going to mitigate for the terrestrial species outside the BDCP?**

**A:** There will be mitigation identified for any significant impact. Yes.

**Q: What about species that are federally listed for no take?**

**A:** We will have to get take authority under section 7 for special species impacts. We will get take authority under section 10. This habitat conservation process is for aquatic species.

**Q: Why are terrestrial species not put into this?**

**A:** It gets to be the focus of the plan. Part of the problem with any planning process is that you can make it very big and make a statewide plan if you wanted to. In order to get through this process we must focus on the Delta and on aquatic species in the Delta. We look at the terrestrial species that affect the fish. Interrelated terrestrial habitats will be looked at as part of the conservation plan. The snake for example will be a potentially effected species, but we are not going to develop a conservation plan for the snake necessarily. We will create any mitigation measures for snake habitat under section 7, but we may not need a conservation plan for that species under this process. It's a little complicated. I appreciate that.

**Q: I'm not sure how you will get take authority for certain species. We have our own habitat conservations plans. For example, San Joaquin County does not have that authority because it is a non take species. It's something that we have asked ourselves meaning how are we, the Habitat Conservation Plan within the Delta area, going to deal with terrestrial species. It has never been answered. How are you going to address this? Water conveyance is not something that is covered under most of our plans. This is a very specific plan where this is all it is for.**

**A:** One thing. These surveys will look to see if those species are in that area. We may avoid an area to avoid having a take. Part of the reason for the surveys is to see if an area has snakes in it or other species where we do have that kind of problem will help us avoid those.

**Q: I'm an independent riparian water right researcher and a supporter of the 20 Island landowners and growers. Not long ago we had hurricane Katrina in New Orleans. Within the last couple of years we have been thinking about and planning to shore up the levees on the islands, particularly the State owned levees. I'm wondering if anything in the conservation plan is contemplating to assist that process in any way.**

**A:** It is not directly related to that. There may be issues as we move forward. We may need to strengthen levees to make the canal work. There may be some interaction there.

The other thing that I'm finding is that we are always looking for opportunities as we do maintenance activities, or as we do levee setbacks or other maintenance or construction activities. I'm trying to find mitigation opportunities for those activities. You go out there and maintain a levee then you have to go out there to mitigate the effects that you had. What we are finding is that the program is looking at the same kinds of parcels that maintenance work and the BDCP is looking for from the aquatic side. It may be the same piece of property. By joining our efforts we can get a convergence of resources where we might purchase an area that provides for mitigation opportunities for levee activities, but also provide habitat for the fish. There is a synergy between the two programs that we are going to try to take advantage of and move forward.



**Q: Has Fish and Game, USACE, Bureau of Reclamation been notified of your plans for the next three years to go on landowner land to do the surveys and core sampling? Do they have any input?**

**A:** They are part of our process.

**Q: The Farm Bureau is an organization that represents 500 farmers and ranchers here in San Joaquin County. Many of them are sitting in this room tonight and are also out in the Delta. We are very familiar with this process and are glad that the California Farm Bureau is involved. There have been a lot of comments tonight and we have heard a lot of the same comments over and over again, but you have to integrate those into your process. You have to integrate those into the report.**

One of my major concerns is among many that have already been stated here, and that is what kind of assurances are you going to give landowners when your teams go out there and they potentially find something? Whether it be a cultural resource or an endangered species. I'm sure that everyone is comfortable with the assurance that if an employee gets hurt out there that it's OK. But what happens if you go out there and you actually find something on their property?

**A:** From a biological perspective the endangered species, as long as the ongoing operations are continued then there would be no impacts associated with the identification of a threatened or endangered species. From that perspective there are no constraints to that ongoing activity. As far as cultural resources go there is no real issue associated with that. The only thing is if you want to demolish a structure or something like that than you have to adhere by local codes and that type of thing. That would be the only thing that is associated with that. The identification of a historical resource would not have an effect on a property.

**Q: What if they change crops? Would that be considered changing operations?**

**A:** Most likely if you were change from a row crop to another row crop that is not a change in conditions. If you were to redevelop the area into residential or industrial uses, that's when you would enter into a changed condition.

**Q: When you put a structure in place you're just reallocating what is already part of the same pie. We know that we do not have enough of that pie right now. We need to create a bigger one. It is a very severe thing that is going on down South of us and we recognize that. We also recognize that the State of California did not keep their promises to those folks down South. Their contract said that in surplus years that you would get water and they believe that they are entitled to it. We don't want to see farmers suffering in other areas. We can not decimate this area and let it turn into a salt water bath.**

**A:** I agree one hundred percent with that. That is not what we are about here. There are ways to create water by how you convey it across the Delta. The example is this year we lost 700

thousand acre feet of water to the other projects that would really relate to the bath water issues, but the inflow issues can be addressed by how you convey water.

**Q: Does that mean that there are regional self sufficiency projects to allow some of that wet year water to go down there?**

**A:** That is what happened in a dry year. What happened is we had opportunities to take what we historically had, but due to concerns of the Delta smelt and how these waters move back there, the Judge said you can't take those waters back this year which are normally taken in the past.

**Q: Where did those waters go? They went down South right?**

**A:** The waters went out the Delta. The water that we didn't take went out the Delta.

**Q: Where does that water historically go?**

**A:** If we did this two years ago we would take that water and send it to Southern California. It would have been water supply. The economy of the State of California right now is about \$1 trillion dollars a year. The economy of the water that moves through the Delta is about 400 billion dollars a year in terms of what it is supporting. It is a good chunk of the economy of the State of California. That is being affected by how we solve this conflict between fish and protecting water supply.

**Q: My point here is that the water that is being lost out of the Delta are flows that are publicly needed in the Delta. We need to have more of these regional self sufficiency projects to take some of those problems on. We don't have enough water resources. We are still short from our water project and the assurances we had from the State of California.**

**A:** A plan developed in 2005 talked about that. We need to use every tool in the tool box to solve our water supply problem. We have to be as efficient as we can. Our goal here is to protect the Delta not to do something different than that.

**Q: I think that what is going on and what people are witnessing is that we disagree.**

**A:** One last piece here on the tools in the tool box. We talk about the need for water conservation, water recycling, and desalination. All of those things are laid out in how we are going to move forward in California to better provide water for the State. Not all of those are going to work. It includes storage upstream. A piece of that is how we can be more efficient in moving water across the Delta. If we changed conveyance, you could leave things the way they are today and provide exactly the same amount to the Delta, protect fish and have a more reliable water supply. We can do that and have the type of assurances you are all going to want.



The real issue here is governance. The standards that are set to protect the Delta have to be set for each water conveyance in the future. Who sets what those standards are and who changes them is a huge issue. Exactly how we convey shouldn't be as important as who sets the standards and who changes the standards. That is a governments issue that we have to address or this is not going to work.

**Q: Is that the goal of the HCP or the goal of Delta Vision?**

**A:** The HCP will have to have an implementation plan in order for it to be effective. The fish agencies are not going to give us permits unless they know that the system that is in place is operated in a specific way. They will control the operations today and they will control the operations tomorrow. We will have to have specific operational criteria that will have to be in place. The Water Board is also going to have to evaluate the criteria and make changes to that. Between those two agencies to give us changes. Those two sets of agencies will determine what the standards are for the estuary. Part of this environmental process is to develop the operating criteria for the facility change that we do. That is going to have to be approved by the Federal fish agencies and the Water Board before we can approve it.

**Q: The environment today, in considering the entire ecosystem, how we fit with it and giving credence and value to other species, not just humans.**

**We are in the process of breeding ourselves out of existence anyway. The population growth curve is bigger than rabbits without predators. My bottom line is that you folks don't seem to get it. You don't get it.**

**You're talking about fish and it is like you can't be bothered with the fish. You're bothered with them because you have to be because it is the law, but not because they have a right to be. They do have a right to be and we do not have the right to kill. Not a whole species. I don't think anyone here can say that they don't need that Delta smelt. We don't really need that salmon. But we do and until you can create another one, you better not get rid of the ones we have.**

**I'm not sure who you are working for, but I don't get the feeling that you're working for me. I think you are working for those people in Southern California and South Valley.**

**A:** I think that what happens here is that what is good for the environment is also good for the water projects. I think that they are beginning to get that. The historical folks thought that we don't have to worry about the environment, that we will get the water we need. What they found over time is that complying with the Endangered Species Act is painful for them and it causes them to lose water. Their life becomes so much easier if they protect fish adequately in the system. That is really their motivation. That is why they are spending money to do this. That is why they will pay for any new conveyance system. That is why it will not be taxpayer issued because they will pay for it down South because they will benefit from the conveyance.

We're talking about 4 to 5 billion dollars because what they have done is they have made the water supply more stable because of the regulatory environment. There is something in it for them.

**Q: Is there any possibility of not sending water to the Southern California area and what would be the alternative?**

**A:** I think we have the same water dance song. I think that most of our economy with respect to industry has gone south. It is part of California. We have to send water.

**Q: I was interested in alternatives such as reservoirs or other projects in the South that would help that and not use the water from the Central Valley.**

**A:** I think that they are doing that. I think that it has to be a combination of reservoirs and the water going down South. I know that Southern California has built new reservoirs. Diamond Valley is a prime example. San Diego is increasing some of their storage reservoirs. It is not just reservoirs; they are trying to reclaim more of their water. They are going more with ground water and recharging their basins when they can.

**Q: The only thing that concerns me is that there doesn't seem to be enough water to go around. Now we are just trying to bypass the Delta and take the water from Shasta and the Central Valley and give it to down South. It doesn't seem to be an equitable situation. It's a no win situation. That is the problem I find.**

**A:** I share your concerns. If you look at our population we are up to about 36 million. By 2050 we are expected to jump way up. I think that is why the Governor and the Director are looking at additional storage. Hopefully we can move forward on that. I think that we have to capture the extra water when we can.

**Q: I was wondering if the Governor ever thought about doing solar panels? I know we have an initiative for doing solar panels, but have we ever thought of systems for urban areas and using the rain water or something like that.**

**A:** We have grant programs to approach local water agencies to look into that type of infrastructure. We ourselves are not looking at that. We have looked at solar farms for small components of our facilities to try to help with that, but we really count on local water agencies to do those types of projects. Again that is why we have this grant program we utilize.

**Q: If we would have less water going out the Delta would there be greater salt intrusions? Because we would be sending more water down South and if you send more water down South, less water would be going down the Delta and affect the salt intrusion. Salt intrusion is coming up more and more all the time. I'm just curious on that.**

**A:** You're right. If you change the outflow you would potentially have more saltwater intrusion come in if you change that. That really is a standards issue. What we have right now are standards for salinity lines out here in the estuary. We have salinity standards for agriculture, the canal, and for public lands. Those standards are in place and they are met each year.

The question is if these standards are going to be the safe standards in the future and are they going to be continued to be met. They can be met with the system we have today or a changed system. What we really need is standards that we know people are going to meet. That is really a Governance issue not a facilities issue.

**Q: I worry that once you have a canal in there, all of a sudden you have salt that comes farther and farther up the river because we are shipping more water down south. We won't have enough flow all of the time.**

**A:** Right now you can only let salt water come in so far because if you let it come in too far we start getting salt water into our pumps and that becomes a problem. The automatic control in the system that exists right now on how we convey water across the Delta, but our concern is that system going across the Delta is not what the Federal Courts think is very protective of fish. We need to address ways to change that.

One way to do that is to change conveyance. Then what you're doing is relying on the Governance structure to make sure that the standards are met. Let me give you a brief example. One of the concerns that we have heard from the community so far is, if you build it they will take it. If you build the Peripheral Canal or a similar facility then they will take all the water they can. I appreciate that concern. I think it is valid concern that needs to be addressed.

A real life example is that when I was working at the Water Board and related to Mono Lake. There was a case where the Water Board would issue permits to take water before it got to Mono Lake and people were concerned about that. There was about 18 years of litigation and we went back the board and worked on a decision. We went back to LA and said even though you have the facilities here to take the water you can no longer take that water. You have to put it back into those creeks that run into Mono Lake. That was 15 years ago. If you go look at the Mono Lake Committees website the water is coming back. The streams systems are doing better. The fisheries are doing better and are becoming much more populated in the area and its working. There is a case where not only do you have an existing system that could take the water, but they don't because they comply with the laws and they were actually doing it historically. But now they are not doing it and they are complying with the laws.

So just because they have a pump in place does not mean people are going to use it. We're a State agency and we have to comply with the laws. We could take a lot more water out of the system today and could have taken 750 million more water out of the system, but the Federal Courts we're all over our case about it. But we don't because we are a society of laws.

The real question about the Peripheral Canal is how do you govern this stuff and how do you make sure that people comply with it. People comply with the standards now. That is the saltwater intrusion and the hope is that it will continue in the future.

**Q: My understanding is that when they put I-5 in, they started digging up the Peripheral Canal itself. Am I correct or am I wrong?**

**A:** What happened was I-5 needed extra dirt and they said you could borrow some dirt from over here along the alignment. At that time it would have been the Peripheral Canal alignment. So at that time we said take dirt from this area over here because we own it. If you got on an airplane and looked down you would see these little dots going along the system that reflect the old alignment. We can't use that any more because all of that is now habitat. If we put the alignment in those areas we would have to mitigate for the marsh lands that now developed there so we are going to have to move the alignment further west of it because of other issues. I think you are right. Those are the pits we used for the development of I-5.

**Q: What other alternatives did you look at specifically for fish? This is what this conversation is about. We are trying to save the fish. We have to save the fish. What are the alternatives?**

**A:** With the CalFed program we basically tried to set up the concept that we are currently operating under. We have done things like improve our fish handling facility at our pumping plant. We got newer trucks to make the survival better for the fish we do collect in the system. We have looked at different ways to operate the Delta crosscanal here. We close the crosschannel now in the month of December, which is better for salmon to move about the system.

We have done a lot to understand how the system works and try to make the system in the Delta better. In addition, we had an environmental count that started in 2001 and went through 2007 where we actually purchased additional water supplies for the environment to better protect fish. In that period of time we took 2 million acre feet of fish access and controlled exports when fish agencies thought it would be better for fish. That program cost about 200 million dollars over 7 years and we didn't get much from it. The fish agencies at the time hoped that this added protections would protect fish and it didn't seem to help much.

We did a lot to make the current system we do have more effective, but we had this same conversation about this with the fish agencies in 2005. This is not working for us. We're doing all we can with the system we have. It's just not working the way we hoped it would work. That is why we are looking at a different option than that through Delta concept.

**Q: It seems to me that instead of running that canal back up north, if you run south. You could put the fish in and then when they come in you could put a screen in and slew. Then the fish would slide down.**

**Also, we haven't talked about flood control. People of California passed a 5 billion dollar bond issue for levees. You take 5 million of the 5 billion and build a slough somewhere. Put one in Paradise Cut and one on the East San Joaquin River.**

**What I see is that the State wants to get out of the responsibility of keeping up with the drain system. So really, if you are out to protect the fish, I think you need to design a better system and move the fish and not the water. If you want to protect the levees and make life better for us here, then the Department of Water Resources should take responsibility for all the existing levees that are here. That would be my position. Don't make another canal, when you can't take care of what you got.**

**A:** Thanks. We're talking about the fact that we need to develop. We have resources to invest in Delta levees over the next several years. Probably a decade or two and we want to develop a strategic plan on how to invest in the Delta in the most effective way. We are going to be developing that out of a levee program. So we want to be able to do both. We want to invest in the levees with or without any kind of conveyance facility in mind. People of California decided that flood control is an important piece for California and an important piece of that will come from the Delta. The other part is a separate question: how do you improve conveyance in a way that also protects fish and other infrastructure relationship issues in the Delta, too?

I know that there are some challenging issues on the Swiss Canal. I understand that it is a non-project system and it certainly is one of those areas that we are going to provide assistance to. We will look at the geotechnical issues associated with the Swiss Canal. We are also looking forward to supporting San Joaquin County and others in the area. We will look at a feasibility study to look at a larger area. We clearly understand that this area needs it and we are trying to make progress and we will so we look forward to that, if you participate in our Central Valley Flood Protection Plan outreach process.

**Q:** I haven't heard anything from you about environmental justice. Every time I get in my boat and I sail down the channel I see people fishing on the banks. Those people are not here tonight because they don't even know this is here. They don't even know the issue and they don't know that they should be worried about the fish they are catching and eating because they don't read English sometimes.

**They are not the \$25,000 bass fishermen that I also see out there. Those folks are catching them and taking them home and feeding those fish to their children and to their wives, who may or may not be pregnant. I would not eat any fish caught in that river personally and yet I haven't heard you say one word about how you're going to get input from those people. You're talking about degrading the water quality that is already polluted.**

**They are not here at this meeting. They are not going to be at any meeting you have. They are not going to put any input into any environmental impact studies. Are you going to go out and talk to them? Mostly they are uninformed. What are you going to do about that?**

**A:** The Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement will address environmental justice as part of utilizing the resources including fisheries. It will also include recreation because many of those issues are associated with lower income and/or minority populations. The economic evaluation will address issues related to both income generation associated with the uses associated with the plan. The socioeconomic section is what we lump that section into and we will be evaluating each and every one of the alternatives. It will address them equally so each alternative, including the no project alternative, will be compared and contrasted against each one of the alternatives.